1	SHANNON G. SPLAINE, ESQ.		
2	Nevada Bar No. 8241 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS, LLI	•	
3	ATTORNEYS AT LAW 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway		
4	Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5968		
5	Telephone: (702) 257-1997 Facsimile: (702) 257-2203		
6	ssplaine@lgclawoffice.com		
7	Attorneys for Defendant, MRS BPO, LLC		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA		
10	KIRBY SPENCER,	Case No. 2:14-cv-01833-MMD-GWF	
11	Plaintiff,		
12	v.	DEFENDANT MRS BPO, LLC's ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE	
13	MRS BPO, LLC, a foreign limited-liability	DEFENSES TO PLAINTIFF'S COMPLAINT	
14	Company doing business in Nevada,		
15	Defendant.		
16			
17	Defendant MRS BPO, LLC ("MRS"), through counsel and pursuant to the Federal Rules of		
18	Civil Procedure, submits this Answer and Affirmative Defenses to the Class Action Complaint filed		
19	by plaintiff Kirby Spencer ("plaintiff"), and states:		
20	INTRODUCTION		
21	1. MRS admits plaintiff purports to bring this action for alleged violations of the		
22	Telephone Consumer Protection Act ("TCPA"), 47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq., but denies any liability,		
23	violations or wrongdoing under the law.		
24	<u>JURISDI</u>	CTION AND VENUE	
25	2. MRS admits the allegations in ¶	2 for jurisdictional purposes only.	
26	3. MRS admits the allegations in ¶ 3 for jurisdictional purposes only.		
27	4. MRS admits the allegations in ¶ 4 for venue purposes only.		
28			

-1-

5.

plaintiff is entitled to declaratory relief.

1

2

3

MRS denies the allegations in \P 5 as calling for a legal conclusion and denies that

PARTIES

4	6.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 6 for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to	
5	form a belief therein.		
6	7.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 7 for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to	
7	form a belief therein and as calling for a legal conclusion.		
8	8.	MRS admits that it is a New Jersey limited liability company doing business in Nevada	
9	Except as specifically admitted, MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 8.		
10	9.	MRS denies the allegations in \P 9 as calling for a legal conclusion.	
11	STATEMENT OF FACTS		
12	10.	MRS reasserts the foregoing as if fully incorporated herein.	
13	11.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 11.	
14	12.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 12 for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to	
15	form a belief therein.		
16	13.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 13 for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to	
17	form a belief therein.		
18	14.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 14.	
19		FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF	
20	DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT		
21	15.	MRS reasserts the foregoing as if fully incorporated herein.	
22	16.	Section 227(b)(3)(A) of the TCPA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of it	
23	contents. To the extent that plaintiff states otherwise, MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 16 as callir		
24	for a legal conclusion.		
25	17.	Section 227(b)(3)(B) of the TCPA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of it	
26	contents. To the extent that plaintiff states otherwise, MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 17 and as callir		
27	for a legal conclusion.		
28	18.	MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 18.	
- 1	1		

9 10

11 12

13

15

14

16 17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24

25 26

27 28

- 19. The TCPA speaks for itself and is the best evidence of its contents. To the extent that plaintiff states otherwise, MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 19.
 - 20. MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 20.
- 21. MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 21 for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief therein.
 - 22. MRS denies the allegations in ¶ 22.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

23. MRS denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

24. MRS denies that plaintiff is entitled to the relief sought.

MRS' AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

- 1. Plaintiff has not stated a claim upon which relief may be granted. First, the telephonic system used by MRS does not meet the statutory definition of an "automatic telephone dialing system" because the telephonic system does not have the capacity to store or produce telephone numbers to be called, using a random or sequential number generator; and to dial such numbers. See 47 U.S.C. 227(a)(1). Further, plaintiff has failed to allege and cannot assert facts necessary to establish that he was called using an automatic telephone dialing system. Plaintiff also was not charged for any of the calls made by MRS or messages left by MRS. See 47 U.S.C. 227(b)(1)(A)(iii).
- 2. Plaintiff's claims, in whole or in part, are barred by the statute of limitations and/or laches.
- 3. Plaintiff's claims are barred by the doctrine of avoidable consequences, failure to mitigate, estoppel, waiver, unclean hands, consent and/or assumption of risk in that plaintiff: refused and/or failed to answer the calls or return the messages left; made no request for the calls to cease or otherwise object to the calls; and knowingly and intentionally allowed and facilitated the calls to continue with the sole purpose to accumulate statutory damages under the TCPA.
- Any harm suffered by plaintiff was legally and proximately caused by persons or entities other than MRS and was beyond the control or supervision of MRS or for whom MRS was

and is not responsible or liable. In particular and without limitation, the number at issue was provided 1 2 to MRS by the placing creditor with the express and/or implied warranty that the debtor consented to and authorized calls to the number. 3 5. Plaintiff consented and authorized calls to the phone number in question for the account 4 that MRS was working. 5 WHEREFORE, Defendant, MRS BPO, LLC, requests that the Court dismiss this action with 6 prejudice and grant it any other relief that the Court deems appropriate. 7 DATED this | day of December, 2014. 8 9 LINCOLN, GUSTAFSON & CERCOS, LLP 10 11 Nevada Bar No. 8241 12 3960 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 200 Las Vegas, Nevada 89169-5968 13 Attorneys for Defendant, MRS BPO, LLC 14 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 15 I certify that on this 12th day of December, 2014, a copy of the foregoing was filed 16 electronically in the ECF system. Notice of this filing will be sent to the parties of record by operation 17 of the Court's electronic filing system, including Plaintiff's counsel as described below. Parties may 18 access this filing through the Court's system. 19 20 Craig K. Perry, Esq. Craig K. Perry & Associates 21 7795 West Sahara Avenue, Suite 101 Las Vegas, Nevada 89117 22 23 Staci D. Ibarra, an employee 24 of the law offices of Lincoln, Gustafson & Cercos, LLP 25 26 v:\p-t\spencer_mrs\attorney notes\drafts\pleadings\20141212_ans.docx 27

28